

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-42 were pending. In the present response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8 and 40, and cancelled claims 41-42, leaving claims 1-40 pending in the present application for the Examiner's consideration.

In summary of the Office Action of November 10, 2004, the Examiner has:

- I. Rejected Claims 1-7 and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Golding et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,218) (hereinafter referred to as "Golding"); and
- II. Rejected Claims 8-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golding et al. in view of Leshem et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,383); and
- III. Rejected Claims 34-36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golding et al. in further view of Martin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,338,066).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Independent Claim 1, 8 and 40

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to state, in part:

wherein the means are capable of categorizing at least one of the events into multiple categories;

The Applicant respectfully submits that Golding fails to disclose or suggest this claim element.

Golding teaches a method of calculating the usefulness of an URL returned from a search query by combining the relevance of the URL to the search query and the quality of the URL. The quality of an URL is derived from how many times the URL has been clicked by users. When a user issues a search query, and clicks on a URL in the result page, a click record is created in a click log, which associates the URL with the search query.

The Examiner has interpreted the search query of Golding as a category as recited by claim 1. However, even if the association between a search query and a URL click is considered a means for categorizing events into categories, Golding only discloses associating each URL click (event) with a single search query (category). Golding does not disclose or suggest associating a single URL click (event) with multiple categories.

In contrast, the invention of claim 1 is capable of categorizing an event into multiple categories. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, the cited reference does not show or suggest the features of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is patentable over Golding.

Claims 8 and 40 include similar limitations to claim 1, and the Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 8 and 40 are patentable for similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2-7 (dependent from claim 1), claims 9-39 (dependent from claim 8) derive patentability therefrom.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are patentable and in condition for allowance and respectfully request an action to that end.

The Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned if he believes a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

4/11/05
Date


Jonathan M. Hollander
Reg. No. 48,717

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
JMH:asb
60370238 v1